

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. Claims 12, 14, and 16 are amended by the present response.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 10, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,742,927 to Crozier et al. (herein "Crozier") in view of U.S. patent 5,687,285 to Katayanagi et al. (herein "Katayanagi"). Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Crozier/ Katayanagi as applied to claim 2 in view of U.S. patent 6,477,489 to Lockwood et al. (herein "Lockwood"). Claims 4 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Crozier/ Katayanagi as applied to claim 1 in view of U.S. patent 5,668,927 to Chan et al. (herein "Chan"). Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Crozier as modified as applied to Claim 4, and further in view of Lockwood. Claims 6 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Crozier/ Katayanagi as applied to claim 2 in view of Chan. Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Crozier as modified as applied to Claim 6, and further in view of Lockwood. Claims 12-17 were objected to as dependent upon a rejected base claim, but are noted as allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of their base claim and any intervening claims.

Initially, applicants gratefully acknowledge the early indication of the allowable subject matter in Claims 12-17.

With respect to the objected to subject matter of claims 12-17, each of claims 12, 14, and 16 is amended by the present response to be rewritten in independent form, and thus those claims are now believed to be allowable based on the indication of allowable subject matter in the outstanding Office Action. Further, claims 13, 15, and 17 depend from one of

the newly rewritten allowable independent claims, and thus those claims are also believed to be allowable.

Addressing now the above-noted prior art rejections, those rejections are traversed by the present response.

The basis for each of the rejections of independent Claims 1, 10, and 11 recognizes deficiencies in Crozier with respect to the noise-likeness analyzing unit, and specifically states “Crozier does not disclose the noise-likeness analyzing unit...which performs correlation analysis on the low pass residual signal”.¹ To overcome the recognized deficiencies in Crozier the outstanding Office Action relies on the teachings in Katayanagi. However, Katayanagi does not overcome the recognized deficiencies in Crozier as Katayanagi does not describe or suggest performing *correlation analysis* on a low pass residual signal. Instead Katayanagi merely describes using a vector sum excited linear predictor (VSELP) to analyze parameters such as speech frame power, reflection and linear prediction coefficients, pitch frequency, codebook, and pitch or codebook gain to detect the background noise level.² Katayanagi nowhere describes or suggests performing correlation analysis. Also, the outstanding Office Action has not indicated or pointed to any element or disclosure in Katayanagi directed to performing correlation analysis on a low pass residual signal.

In such ways, applicants respectfully submit that Katayanagi does not overcome the recognized deficiencies of Crozier with respect to the claimed features as currently written. Thereby, each of the claims is believed to distinguish over the combination of teachings of Crozier in view of Katayanagi.

Moreover, with respect to the further dependent claims, applicants respectfully submit those claims also distinguish over the applied art, particularly as none of these further cited

¹ Office Action of September 21, 2005, page 4, lines 5-7.


² Katayanagi Col 7, lines 15-67, to Col 8, lines 1-22.

teachings to Lockwood or Chan are believed to overcome the above-noted deficiencies of Crozier in view of Katayanagi.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423